

SLIGP 2.0 Grant Closeout Report				2. Award or Grant Number:	44-10-S18044
				4. EIN:	05-6000522
1. Recipient Name	Rhode Island Emergency Management Agency			6. Report Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	06/28/2021
3. Street Address	645 New London Ave.			7. Reporting Period End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021
5. City, State, Zip Code	Cranston, RI 02920			8. Final Report	
				Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
				No <input type="checkbox"/>	
9. Project/Grant Period				10. Reserved for Reviewer	
9a. Start Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/01/2018	9b. End Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)	03/31/2021		
11. Program Activities					
11a. Identify the activities you performed during SLIGP2.0 grant period of performance					
	Activity Type (Planning, Governance Meetings, etc.)	Was this Activity Performed during the grant period? (Yes/No)	Total Project Deliverable Quantity (Number)	Description of Activity Deliverable Quantity	
1	Governance Meetings	Yes	24	Cumulative number of governance, subcommittee, or working group meetings related to the NPSBN held during the grant period	
2	Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences	Yes	2	Cumulative number of individuals sent to national or regional third-party conferences with a focus or training track related to the NPSBN using SLIGP 2.0 grant funds during the grant period	
3	Convened Stakeholder Events	No	0	Cumulative number of events coordinated or held using SLIGP 2.0 grant funds during the grant period, as requested by FirstNet.	
4	Staff Hired (Full-Time Equivalent)(FTE)	Yes	0.81	Cumulative number of state/territory personnel FTEs who began supporting SLIGP 2.0 activities during the grant period (may be a decimal).	
5	Contracts Executed	No	0	Cumulative number of contracts executed during the grant period.	
6	Subrecipient Agreements Executed	Yes	1	Cumulative number of agreements executed during the grant period.	
7	Data Sharing Policies/Agreements Developed	No		Yes or No if data sharing policies and/or agreements were developed during the grant period.	
8	Further Identification of Potential Public Safety Users	No		Yes or No if further identification of potential public safety users occurred during the grant period.	
9	Plans for Emergency Communications Technology Transitions	No		Yes or No if plans for future emergency communications technology transitions occurred during the grant period.	
10	Identified and Planned to Transition PS Apps & Databases	No		Yes or No if public safety applications or databases within the State or territory were identified and transition plans were developed during the grant period	
11	Identify Ongoing Coverage Gaps	No		Yes or No if participated in identifying ongoing coverage gaps using SLIGP 2.0 funds during the grant period.	
12	Data Collection Activities	No		Yes or No if participated in data collection activities as requested by FirstNet	

11b. Please provide a description of each activity reported in response to Question 11; any challenges or obstacles encountered and mitigation strategies you employed; and any additional project milestones or information. +A25:J28

11a1. Governance Meetings - Governance Meetings held through the State Interoperable Communications Committee (ICC) include meeting dates in 2018: Mar, Apr, Jun, Aug, Oct, Nov, & Dec. 2019: Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Sep, Oct, & Nov. 2020: Jan, Feb, Mar, Sep, Nov, & Dec. 2021: Jan, Feb, & Mar. Scope of the meetings included general FirstNet news, progress on AT&T FirstNet state commitments, discussions on new features including timing of availability, as well as the progress of service adoption across the RI public safety community. On Mar. 9, 2020 Governor Raimondo declared a State of Emergency due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The ICC meetings were discontinued through Sep 2020, and when resumed, were conducted virtually. As of the end of the SLIGP 2.0 project, the State of Emergency was still in effect and the ICC meetings still held remotely over the Internet. **11a2. Individuals Sent to Broadband Conferences** - Stuart Freiman attended the International Wireless Communications Expo (IWCE), March 5-8, 2019 in Las Vegas, NV where he primarily focused on the FirstNet & Public Safety Broadband sessions track. Stuart Freiman attended the New England Regional FirstNet Meeting held in NH Sept 10 & 11, 2019. **11a4. Staff Hired** - In Q1 2018, Tom Guthlein assumed the FirstNet Program Officer (.75 FTE) position, and Catherine Avila assumed responsibility for SLIGP Grant Finance (.06 FTE), which together, accounted for the initial .81 FTE tallied in Q1. In Q2 2019 Tom Guthlein was promoted to Chief Administrative Officer at RI Emergency Management Agency and was no longer paid using SLIGP funds (as of May 2019). This resulted in a reduction in the quarter from .75 FTE to .50 FTE for his time and to .00 FTE in the ensuing quarter (Q3 2019). Tom remained connected to the project though his position was not replaced. In Q2 2018, Catherine Avila was replaced by RIEMA CFO Terry Chalko, at the same .06 FTE percentage. At the onset of the COVID pandemic in March 2020, project personnel were reassigned to pandemic response and ceased drawing funds from the SLIGP 2.0 grant. This continued through the end of the project. **11a5. Contracts Executed** - There were two contracts budgeted at the outset of the SLIGP 2.0 project including: 1) Development of Broadband Standard Operating Procedure – which was to detail State policies and procedures for network primary and extended users, decision trees for enabling preemption, and network interoperability, and 2) Data Collection Project which anticipated that FirstNet would request a data collection effort from the State that required the use of a consultant to accomplish. Through discussion with NTIA Program Office, the first project became the RI FirstNet State Planning Document, which was created without the need for a contract agreement. Project two did not materialize and hence did not elicit a contract agreement. Hence, no contracts were executed through the SLIGP 2.0 grant. **11a6. Subrecipient Agreements** - In Q2 2018, a subrecipient agreement was signed with Rhode Island Commerce Corporation which assigned Commerce employee Stuart Freiman as FirstNet Project Manager. The contracted time commitment was allocated at .80 FTE for Stuart's time. The contract continued until June 30, 2020 when Stuart was reassigned to COVID response. After reassignment, Stuart continued to manage FirstNet day-to-day planning issues as well as grant reporting through the term of the project.

11c. Did you perform activities during the last quarter of the grant that haven't been reported previously (i.e., new programmatic activities, staffing changes)? If so, please describe.

In Q1 (Jan-Mar 2021) the State held three virtual governance meetings through the State Interoperable Communications Committee (ICC) on the dates Jan 5, Feb 2, & Mar 2, 2021. In addition to governance, RIEMA collaborated with FirstNet liaison Gary McCarraher to convene the initial Rhode Island FirstNet webinar on January 27, 2021. It was well attended with about 15 participants. With regards to grant finances, RIEMA finalized SLIGP 2.0 budget modification with NIST/NTIA which enabled the State to utilize RIEMA Indirect Rate budget as match for the grant. The calculations and numbers are included in the SLIGP 2.0 closeout documents. Although no new charges were incurred, two adjustments were made to the federal expenditures budget in the amounts of \$5,539.53 (reduction to the Personnel line item as a result of a chargeback to a different grant) and \$57,617.67 (addition to the Contracts line item due to a payment made to the Commerce corporation which was delayed several months due to COVID) for a total addition of \$52,078.14 in federal expenditures in the final report. Final matching funds were also adjusted to account for the changes.

11d. Please share any lessons learned or best practices that your organization implemented during your SLIGP 2.0 project.

New processes and ideas are just starting to evolve as the State is scratching the surface of the value that FirstNet will bring to the public safety community. From a best practices point-of-view the focus has been how to use FirstNet in our emergency response processes. For example, the State utilized FirstNet when a natural gas issue forced the shutdown of the entire natural gas system in Newport, Rhode Island in the winter of 2019, which left 7,455 residents and businesses in Newport and Middletown without heat and hot water for up to week. FirstNet was provisioned to personnel who were dispatched to every location to determine if the gas was shut off at that location. This information was reported back to the command center to efficiently expedite the process. As another example, FirstNet was used as part of the State's COVID-19 response efforts. Phones were provided to testing, temporary hospital and contract tracing personnel involved in their respective operations.

Total Funds Allocated to Contracts							\$284,627.18	\$87,510.35
------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------	-------------

14. Budget Worksheet
 Columns 2, 3 and 4 must match your project budget for the entire award and your final SF 424A. Columns 5, 6, and 7 should list your final budget figures, cumulative through the last quarter

Project Budget Element (1)	Federal Funds Awarded (2)	Approved Matching Funds (3)	Total Budget (4)	Final Federal Funds Expended (5)	Final Approved Matching Funds Expended (6)	Final Total Funds Expended (7)
a. Personnel Salaries	\$174,855.00	\$0.00	\$174,855.00	\$104,094.60		\$104,094.60
b. Personnel Fringe Benefits	\$83,008.00	\$0.00	\$83,008.00	\$52,932.46		\$52,932.46
c. Travel	\$10,800.00	\$0.00	\$10,800.00	\$1,993.95		\$1,993.95
d. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00			\$0.00
e. Materials/Supplies	\$11,500.00	\$0.00	\$11,500.00	\$1,199.83		\$1,199.83
f. Contractual	\$347,120.00	\$133,272.00	\$480,392.00	\$284,627.18	\$87,510.35	\$372,137.53
g. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$65.39		\$65.39
h. Indirect	\$0.00	\$23,718.00	\$23,718.00		\$23,718.00	\$23,718.00
i. Total Costs	\$627,283.00	\$156,990.00	\$784,273.00	\$444,913.41	\$111,228.35	\$556,141.76
j. Proportionality Percent	80%	20%	100%	80%	20%	100%

15. Additional Questions: Read each statement below. Rate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement and answer follow-up questions to provide additional information.


Statement	Agree/Disagree	Additional Questions	Response
15a. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in planning for the integration with the NPSBN.	3-Neutral	What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?	If "planning for the integration with the NPSBN" is interpreted as planning for how the public safety community integrates FirstNet with existing public safety communications systems or processes, then our response would have to be "neutral" to this question for two reasons: 1) Overall user adoption of FirstNet has been "slow and highly evolutionary" as opposed to revolutionary and hence the overall integration process will take far longer than the SLIGP 2.0 grant period. In some sense, the FirstNet technology can exist separately from current Land Mobile Radio (LMR) systems and there is not an imperative to speed up that process. LMR is deeply embedded in public safety operations, and FirstNet has not accelerated the demand to push it forward more quickly, 2) LMR/LTE integration is not well understood yet by the public safety community and is still considered nascent technology. Without the urgency or necessity to accelerate the process, it will continue at an evolutionary pace. That said, the funds certainly helped spark the conversation and inclusion of FirstNet in the state communications planning efforts and specifically the Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP).

<p>15b. I plan to continue any SLIGP 2.0 program activities beyond the SLIGP 2.0 period of performance.</p>	<p>4-Agree</p>	<p>What do you plan to accomplish after the period of performance?</p>	<p>FirstNet is now part of the SCIP (see above) and as such is considered a component of the State's communications infrastructure. In addition, the State plans to continue the following: 1) Include FirstNet at the monthly Interoperable Communications Committee (ICC) meetings, which is the State's communications governance board, 2) Work with FirstNet to hold webinar's and perhaps in-person meetings which provide training and information about FirstNet features and uses, 3) Work with AT&T to assure that the contractual commitments made by AT&T for FirstNet infrastructure in the state is met, and 4) As the FirstNet adoption rate increases and the technology and capabilities mature, LTE/LMR interoperability and integration will continue to evolve and make its way into communications standard operating procedures (SOPs).</p>
<p>15c. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in informing my stakeholders about FirstNet.</p>	<p>5-Strongly Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>Certainly most helpful were the funds used to pay for staff and contract labor who created a center of expertise and widely disseminated information about FirstNet for the State. These resources were instrumental in becoming points-of-contact (POCs) within the State for FirstNet information and questions. Dedicating resources to help facilitate that work was invaluable to the State. At the outset, the major challenge we faced was coordinating with AT&T to understand who they were talking to and what commitments they made at a local level as we were also trying to maintain a state-level focus. In essence, AT&T "took over" and we had to work hard to understand how to operate with this new model - and specifically, where the dividing line was between AT&T's responsibilities and the State's responsibilities.</p>
<p>Statement</p>	<p>Agree/Disagree</p>	<p>Additional Questions</p>	<p>Response</p>

<p>15d. SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in maintaining a governance structure for broadband in my state/territory.</p>	<p>5-Strongly Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>Most helpful were the funds used to pay for staff and contract labor to focus on FirstNet planning and project management for the State. On the heels of the opt-in decision and the choice of AT&T as the FirstNet network supplier/partner, there was still a lot of work to do to transition from making the decision to working with FirstNet and AT&T to communicate the decision. This included helping get the message out to the local public safety community, and transitioning to a planning function and answering the question of "how" it will get done, from the "if" and "when" questions. Having dedicated resources to help facilitate that work was invaluable to the State.</p>
<p>15e. SLIGP 2.0 funds provided resources that were helpful in preparing for FirstNet planning activities in my state/territory (e.g. staffing, attending broadband conferences, participating in training, procuring contract support etc.).</p>	<p>5-Strongly Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>The funds were instrumental in paying staffing and contract labor, as well as paying for travel and attendance at important broadband conferences and meetings. This work would not have happened without the SLIGP funding. The major challenge we faced was spending the additional contract dollars allocated for both the planning and data collection projects. Ultimately, additional data collection was not required, but we did not have a chance to fully develop the planning document before the COVID pandemic hit. As the grant was housed at the Rhode Island Emergency Management Agency, the pandemic impacted our efforts to spend any quality time on the project other than reporting, governance and some planning work with FirstNet and AT&T.</p>

<p>15f. Overall, SLIGP 2.0 funds were helpful in preparing for FirstNet.</p>	<p>5-Strongly Agree</p>	<p>What was most helpful? What challenges did you encounter?</p>	<p>The dedicated focus on FirstNet would not have happened without the SLIGP funding. Having staff and contractors to help bridge the transition from the Opt-In decision to facilitating the inclusion of FirstNet in the State's communications plans and governance has set it on a course to continue after the end of the grant. Besides for the issues we had in working with AT&T at the outset, the major challenge we faced was the COVID pandemic and the impact that had on the progress of the project. For example, perhaps the integration effort mentioned above as well as the planning efforts might be further along now if not for the pandemic. It didn't reverse any progress that was made or will be made, it just added 15 or more months to the timeline.</p>
--	-------------------------	--	--

16. Certification: I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that this report is correct and complete for performance of activities for the purpose(s) set forth in the award documents.

<p>16a. Typed or printed name and title of Authorized Certifying Official:</p>		<p>16c. Telephone: 401-946-9996</p>
<p>Marc Pappas, Director, RIEMA</p>		<p>16d. Email Address: marc.pappas@ema.ri.gov</p>
<p>16b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official:</p>		<p>16e. Date: 6/28/2021</p>

Public Burden Statement: According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 25 hours per response. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Natalie Romanoff, Program Director, State and Local Implementation Grant Program, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW, Room 4078, Washington, DC 20230.